

jects, (be they what they will,) the proofs of Christian Religion are of no value: I answer as before. If the *deceptio visus* of Abraham takes place, his Senses were deceived in taking for a Man, him who was not so; if his Senses might be mistaken in the Angel, they might be as well mistaken in every thing else; if his Senses might be mistaken in the discovery of their Objects (be they what they will) the proofs of Christianity are of no value, because as I told you before, an Infidel in the Drs. principles cannot believe Abrahams Senses were deceived, without granting his own may be mistaken; the Drs. Argument then proves too much, and therefore, according to good Philosophy, nothing. The third Conference being but a repetition of the former, I pass it by; but because the second proposition is the chief ground of the fourth and fifth Conference (and indeed of all the Book) in which the Dr. pretends to prove, that Transubstantiation (p. 60.) opens a gate to Scepticism, in its full perfection, and especially destroys the certainty of demonstration; I will give it a full Answer, and then shall suppose I have performed my promise: The proposition runs thus, (p. 45.) if our Senses deceive us in the report which they make of the Eucharist, they may as well deceive us in every thing else. By the Drs. leave he is grossly mistaken in the first Rudiments of Logic, and therefore I will take the pains to teach him, how he should have framed his Argument, if he intended to conclude any thing: If our Senses deceive us in the report, which they make of the Eucharist, they may as well deceive us in every thing else, in the same circumstances: This without doubt his adversary N. would have granted, and not thought, he had either banisht the proofs of Christianity out of the World, or brought Scepticism into it: but for a Dr. to argue from a particular to an universal, is to declare his own ignorance in Print. We Papists then say; when ever our Senses represent us an Object as such, unless there intervene a proof more prevalent, we may believe them; as also whensoever our reason sticks to a principle, as true, and is drawn away by a no more forcible Argument, we ought to conclude, it is so: but because we have Divine Revelation, which is of a far greater force than either Sense, or Reason, tho' my Sense tells me, when I see a Consecrated Host, 'tis Bread; I must say, 'tis the Body of Christ: altho' my Reason assures me this principle is evident, that those things which are the same with a mean, are the same with themselves; I must Answer 'tis not so, because God has told me there is a Trinity, which contradicts it. But now I conceive 'tis my duty to shew, that the Divine Revelation we have for Transubstantiation is more prevalent, than the Evidence of Sense,

which opposes it. Let us come to our Infidel, before I persuade him to embrace Christianity, we must agree there is one God; that this God is Infinite in every perfection, therefore that he sees truths which we cannot understand; otherwise he would not be Infinite in Knowledge; that he can reveal those truths; otherwise his Power would be limited; that he can oblige his Creatures to believe them; otherwise his Authority would not be Infinite: This a Heathen must grant, because 'tis as evident as that there is a God: then I would ask him, what evidence he required, to rest convinced, that God revealed him the Mystery of Transubstantiation; he would without doubt require such a one, as no Man could prudently call in Question, such as is all Moral Evidence, which added to the forementioned principles, is stronger than that of our Senses, or Reason, which we know may be deceived: Now that this does not bring in Scepticism, nor destroy all demonstration, is evident, because I am to follow the deposition of my Senses, the light of my Reason, where no Divine Revelation; which is a more prevalent Argument does oppose them: So that in other cases I am as sure I am not deceived, as that I have no Divine Revelation; we therefore first prove Divine Revelation, and then the possibility of the thing revealed, as for example, whatever God reveals is true; but God hath revealed Transubstantiation; Ergo 'tis true: The Dr. goes on otherwise, Whatever (says he) is not true, God has not revealed; but the Doctrin of Transubstantiation is not true, Ergo God has not revealed it: according to this method, he must first convince his Infidel Converts of all the strange truths in the Scripture, for example that the World was Created of nothing, that God is one in Nature, three in persons; that all the Sodomites Senses were deceived, when they took the Angels for Young Men, &c. believe me, the Philosophers would not so easily assent to these truths, nor would they ever Anathematize their Books upon the Drs. Authority or Reason.

I must desire those who assist at the Drs. Pulpit heats against Popery, and Transubstantiation, to examin whether his passion against both be not greater than his Reasons, and whether they may in Conscience tie their belief to the Authority of a Man, who undermines his own Religion, so Popery may be involved in the ruin; but God be thanked our Church is too strong to waver at the blasts which flow from his mouth, and will Triumph, when perchance the Dr. may smart for having attempted it's destruction.

FUNDAMENTAL
POSITIONS
AND
QUERIES

Thereupon, Concerning the
FAITH, LAW,
AND
CHURCH of CHRIST;
To be Consider'd, as highly conducing to pub-
lick Peace, Unity and Happiness.

I. **C**HRIST our Lord, reveal'd and reestablish'd a *Faith*, and *Law*, as the Universal and necessary [a] Means for the Ap-
plication of his Blood and Passion to Mankind. a Mark 16. 16.
Heb. 11. v. 6.

II. A Belief and Profession of this *Faith* and *Law*, ought
(at least regarding the Body of *Christianity* in General) to
be Conform, and Adequate to [b] all the Truths or My-
steries so Reveal'd. b Matt. 28. 20.

III. Hence this *Faith* and *Law*, is [c] One, and the same amongst all *Chri-
stians* of what different Nation, and under what distinct Temporal Govern-
ment soever they be. The Universality of which *Christians* thus Combin'd,
and Incorporated in one *Faith* and *Law*, is that which we term the [d] *Catholick Church*: And as this *Faith* and *Law* is One; so is the [e] *Catholick Church* One. c Ephes. 4. v. 4.
d Tim. 3. v. 15.
Matt. 16. 18.
e Joh. 10. v. 16.

IV. This One *Faith* and *Law* thus necessary to the Salvation of all, con-
taining in it many Sublime and Supernatural Mysteries, or Truths, was
deliver'd by Christ the *Law-giver* to the *Apostles*; who as his Vice-gerents
on Earth, were [f] Authoriz'd and Commission'd by Him to Teach others,
with a Promise of Divine Assistance, [g] least they might mislead their Fol-
lowers into Errour; either by Subtraction from, or Addition to these
necessary Mysteries or Truths. f Matt. 28. 16.
Luk. 10. v. 16.
g Joh. 14. v. 16.

V. Accordingly this *Faith* and *Law* was [h] Transmitted by the *Apostles*
to their Successors, and by Them in like manner to others the Successive
Bishops and *Pastors* of the *Catholick Church*. And as the necessity of
Faith in its Unity and [i] Integrity is always the same; so is the Authority
to each, and Divine Assistance not to misguide proportionably the same. h 2 Tim. 2. v. 2.
2 Thess. 2. 15.
i Ephes. 5. v. 5.

VI. Wherefore, As the *Apostles* (gather'd together in the Holy Ghost,)
Exercis'd their Authority in determining [k] Controversies of *Faith*, and re-
quiring [l] a Submission of Judgement from others to their Decisions, in
their time: So also the following *Pastors*, and Governours of the *Catholick Church*
assembled in a General Council, and inspir'd by the same Holy
Ghost, exercis'd the like Authority in deciding the like Controversies,
distinguishing Gospel-Truths from Errour, and requiring the like sub-
mission of Judgement from Believers, as occasion was offer'd in all ensu-
ing Ages. k Acts 15.
l Matt. 18. 17.

QUERIES.